



EDITORIAL

EDITOR'S NOTE

The current issue does not have any particular theme; rather, in the submitted papers previous themes are developed and the new ones are introduced. Thus, in his paper entitled *Fin de Siècle in the Trajectories of Russian Modernity: Novelty and Repetition*, Maxim Khomyakov continues the discussion on modernity in relation to twentieth century Russia. He demonstrates how in Russian constellation of modernity autonomy came to be understood as a secondary to rational mastery and how collective autonomy started to dominate over individual one. For this purpose, he discusses details of N. Federov's "Philosophy of the Common Task", as well as peculiarities of the development of Russian society of the beginning of the last century. In general, the author follows C. Castoriadis' definition of modernity through double imaginary of autonomy and rational mastery as well as P. Wagner's characterisation of modernity as experience and interpretation. Khomyakov stresses that the centenary of Russian October Revolution has raised question on the role of the peculiar cultural phenomenon of the end of XIX – beginning of XX century, the *fin de siècle*, and put the following questions: Why *fin de siècle* is recurrent, if not because of internal apocalypse of the history or because of the psychologically acute perception of the crises in the light of the end of the century? What does it mean for the history? How the cultural phenomena are connected with social and political catastrophes so characteristic for any *fin de siècle*? In his paper, Khomyakov makes an attempt to outline general view of a possible approach to this theme.

In the joint paper under the title *Conformity in Modern Science: An Engine of Societal Transformation?* Natalia Popova, Yan Moiseenko, and Thomas Beavitt indicates the changing role of science in the contemporary world. The research purpose of the authors is to investigate the phenomenon of conformity, which has always played a central role in social life, is acquiring new significance through its impact on science. Though science is penetrating all spheres of life, scientists are increasingly being forced to conform to regulation and bureaucratisation. Sociologists, biologists and psychologists have explored conformity (e.g. conformist behaviour) but, to the authors knowledge, there is no generally accepted understanding of its nature. This paper examines conformity through a comprehensive literature analysis and evaluates its role in shaping modern science. The authors provide some illustrations of how this happens in the everyday lives of researchers, such as the distribution of the IMRAD format of research articles. The authors hypothesize that conformity in science has consequences at three levels: (1) within a scientific community, when scientists follow prescribed patterns of conduct; (2) within a particular society when people from all walks of life conform to the standards set by the scientised world-view; and (3) at the global level when non-western societies conform to Western standards of life by adopting the Western scientific worldview.

Leonid Fishman in the paper *The End of Utopias?* reflects upon the place of creating utopia in the contemporary social thinking and discusses the legitimacy of the question: Are we really living in the era of “the end of utopias”? The author argues that contemporary utopian consciousness should be considered taking into account that utopias are inextricably linked with capitalism; they serve its transformation (defining its “spirit” by its criticism) in transition from one stage to another; they are an expression of the worldviews and aspirations of social groups (classes) rising at different stages of capitalism. Therefore, in order to find the place in the social structure in which modern utopias are born, it is necessary to locate the “rising class”. In the paper, the rising class is defined as one that has, at least potentially, the greatest productivity. When it comes to a contemporary rising class, the source of technical and cultural innovations allegedly playing a decisive role in the economy is usually considered in terms of “creative class” or “cognitariat”. Varieties of modern utopian consciousness are considered, proceeding from the outlined view of the socio-structural transformation of contemporary societies.

The current issue has new section – RESEARCH NOTES – that contain two papers: the first one – *University Students: Connections between Representations of Stress and Coping Strategies* by Irina Kuvaeva, Nadezhda Achan, Ksenia Lozovskaya – discusses the representations of stress (concept of stress) and a variety of coping strategies that people in collectivistic cultures use in attempting to deal with problematic situations. The second one – *Comparative Study of Russian and Slovenian Managers Using Subjective Criteria to Control Their Professional Performance* by Eva Boštjančič, Fayruza S. Ismagilova, Galina Mirolyubova, Nina Janza – presents the results of a Russian-Slovenian cross-cultural study, which describes key structural factors in the subjective criteria of performance monitoring used by Russian and Slovenian managers. The comparative analysis reveals both similarities and differences between Russian and Slovenian approach.

The discussions on the topics raised in the current issue will be continued in the subsequent issues of our journal, and new themes will be introduced. We welcome suggestions for thematic issues, debate sections, book reviews and other formats from readers and prospective authors and invite you to send us your reflections and ideas!

For more information, please visit the journal web-site: <https://changing-sp.com/>

Elena Stepanova
stepanova.elena.a@gmail.com